

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 63748 of 2017

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-13 Year-2016 Thana- Mahila P.S. District- Sheikhpura

Raj Babbar Chauhan @ Raj Babar Chauhan S/o Rambalak Chauhan @
Rambalak Chauchan, resident of village – Afsarh, P.S. - Warsaliganj, District
– Nawadah.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ganita Devi W/o Raj Babbar Chauhan D/o Sitaram Chauhan, resident of
village – Belchhi Bigha, P.S. - Ariyari, District – Sheikhpura.

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Syed. Rizwanul Haque, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Madan Kumar, A.P.P.
	Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3. 07-03-2018 Heard Mr. Syed Rizwanul Haque, learned counsel for the
petitioner, Sri Madan Kumar, learned Addl. Public Prosecutor as
well as Sri Pankaj Kumar, learned counsel, who has appeared on
behalf of opposite party no. 2.

This is the 2nd attempt for grant of anticipatory bail on
behalf of the petitioner in Sheikhpura Mahila P.S. Case No. 13
of 2016. Earlier, the petitioner had approached this Court for the
same relief, vide Cr. Misc. No. 33891 of 2016, however; the
said petition was disposed of on 10-11-2016 on the prayer of
learned counsel for the petitioner, since petitioner wanted to
settle the dispute with opposite party no. 2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner tried to persuade the



Court that the opposite party no. 2 is not ready for settlement, however; Sri Pankaj Kumar, learned counsel for opposite party no. 2 has drawn my attention to order dated 10-10-2017 of the court below (Annexure -3 to the petition) and submits that though, the anticipatory bail petition of petitioner was disposed of long back on 10-11-2016, without any explanation much belatedly in the month of October, 2017, the petitioner filed a petition before the court below and this was the reason that no settlement has taken place.

Besides hearing, I have also perused the material available on record. Normally, I am of the opinion that second anticipatory bail petition may not be entertained. Besides this, fact remains that after disposal of earlier anticipatory bail petition, no appropriate step was taken by the petitioner in the light of settlement of dispute and much belatedly he approached the court below and as such, I do not find any ground to entertain the present petition.

The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

anay

U		T	
---	--	---	--

